

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE

Wednesday, May 6, 1998
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Ocotillo Conference Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Patrick McDermott, Chandler, Chairman
*Mark Mansfield, ADOT
*Mario Mangiamele, Gilbert
*Susan Bookspan, Glendale
*Larry Martinez, Goodyear
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park
Aaron Iverson, Maricopa County

Steve Hancock, Mesa
*Tracy Stevens, Peoria
*John Siefert, Phoenix
Maureen Mageau-DeCindis, RPTA
Amy MacAulay, Scottsdale
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Coomer, MAG
John Farry, MAG
Terry Johnson, MAG

1. Call to Order

Sub-committee chair Steve Hancock called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. Call to the Audience

No audience was present at the meeting.

3. Scoring Systems Used to Rank Bicycle Projects

Steve Hancock addressed the committee to explain the purpose of the meeting. Aaron Iverson asked if both the CMS rating system and the Task Force Project Rating System will be addressed. Steve noted that both would be discussed.

Steve began to describe the CMS Rating System by referring to information enclosed as agenda attachments. Terry Johnson added several comments to the discussion. Terry explained that 45% of the rating system depends on the congestion of the nearest arterials. Therefore, bicycle projects in congested areas will receive higher rankings in the system. In addition, the CMS does not compare across modes. Bicycle projects are evaluated only against other bicycle projects, not against street projects.

Steve added that the multi-modal factors relating to bicycles might need to be changed in the CMS. Terry noted that the system can be changed by Regional Council action. He added that to ease scoring of projects, any changes to the factors should be phrased as questions that could be answered as “yes” or “no” questions. Terry and John Farry explained that the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) is examining how projects are selected for funding, and that policy implications in project selection will likely be addressed in the future. Terry added that qualitative factors can be considered in the rating system through the adoption of principles or guiding policies for project selection. These principles could be incorporated into the Regional Bicycle Plan Update.

Steve mentioned that the bike plan should be adopted by December to allow inclusion of the new rating criteria for selection of next year’s projects. John noted that the plan would have to be done several months prior to allow adoption by the Regional Council in December. The committee then discussed the possibility of using funds for bicycle education or regional demonstration projects.

Aaron Iverson mentioned that some corridors have higher volumes of bicycle travel, and this fact is not reflected in congestion factors. Terry added that this factor is addressed in performance cost factors, and the committee discussed the problem of determining bicycle traffic counts. Steve added that this problem was inherent in the Task Force Rating System as well. Amy MacAulay added that a bike rating system may not be necessary if changes made to the CMS accurately reflect goals and objectives of the Regional Bicycle Plan.

Terry suggested that the committee examine the mobility zone factors as well. Steve mentioned that specific recommendations on changes were needed. He noted that multi-use paths and bike parking were important factors. John Farry added that the air quality benefit of limiting cold starts also needed to be addressed. Steve suggested perhaps looking at the number of destinations affected by a particular project. Mike Cartsonis added that connecting neighborhoods to destinations with grade-separated crossings is important. Terry suggested that system continuity may be important. Terry continued by noting that the Task Force may want to consider subjective factors as part of the bike plan, and adopt some guiding principles for project selection. Dawn Coomer added that guiding principles were the same as planning goals.

Steve suggested discussing the goals and objectives as he had revised them. Mike Cartsonis noted that general statements should be listed first, with more specific statements listed later. The committee generally agreed upon the goals that Steve revised.

Steve continued by distributing a draft Bicycle Task Force Rating System. The committee discussed the revisions briefly. Steve asked for the committee to give him input on the Bike Rating System as well as the CMS Rating System. Pat McDermott added that two agenda items should be on the next meeting notice: Goals and Objectives, and the CMS Rating System.

4. Next Meeting Date and Time

The next meeting is scheduled for May 19, 1998 at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.